

To: StClair, Christie[StClair.Christie@epa.gov]; Card, Joan[Card.Joan@epa.gov]
Cc: Hamilton, Karen[Hamilton.Karen@epa.gov]; Grantham, Nancy[Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov]; Cohen, Nancy[Cohen.Nancy@epa.gov]; Jenkins, Laura Flynn[Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov]; Miller, Johanna[Miller.Johanna@epa.gov]
From: Deitz, Randy
Sent: Mon 2/22/2016 9:58:21 PM
Subject: RE: Animas River health

I have some edits, new text is in bold and deleted text is lined out. Not sure if the word Watershed or River is the right word for my edits in the final two sentences. Thank you.

While the **Animas and San Juan** rivers returned to pre-release conditions downstream, there are still significant metal loadings from numerous mining sources in the Upper Animas mining district.

Historically, the Animas River has an elevated “normal” (pre-event) level of metals independent of the Gold King Mine release, due to the constant supply of acid mine drainage into the river from many sources. There are literally hundreds of old mines, ore processing locations and other places where acid mine drainage containing metals enters small streams and creeks that eventually **ultimately** enter the Animas River.

The **United State Geological Survey (USGS)** conducted sampling in the Animas River in 1995-1996 to measure the amount of metals carried by the river during the spring snowmelt period. They estimated an average metals load of approximately 2,300 kg/day. (In comparison, when the plume from last summer's Gold King Mine release reached the lower Animas River, it carried an estimated average load of 2,000 kg/day.)

EPA and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) conducted a Superfund Site Assessment of the area in the 1990s. The assessment identified the severe impacts to aquatic life in the Upper Animas and its tributaries from naturally occurring and mining-related heavy metals. In recognition of the a community-based collaborative effort, EPA agreed to postpone adding all or a portion of the site **Animas Mining District** to the Superfund NPL, as long as progress was being made to improve the water quality of the Animas River. Until approximately 2005, water quality in the Animas River was improving. However, since 2005, water quality in the Animas River has not improved and, for at least 20 miles below the confluence with Cement Creek and the water quality has declined significantly. Impacts to aquatic life were also demonstrated by fish population surveys conducted by Colorado Parks and Wildlife, which found no fish in the Animas River below Cement Creek for approximately two miles and observed precipitous declines in fish populations as far as 20 miles downstream since 2005. Because of this declining water quality in the Animas River, in 2008, EPA's Superfund Site Assessment program began investigations in Upper Cement Creek focused on evaluating whether the Upper Cement Creek area alone would qualify for inclusion on the NPL. This evaluation indicated that the area would qualify, although after receiving additional community input, EPA postponed efforts to include the area on the National Priorities List. Since that time, EPA has continued and broadened its investigations of conditions at the site **in the area** in order to understand the major sources of heavy metal contamination in the Upper Animas **Watershed**.

The EPA is currently working with state, local and tribal stakeholders to address long-term solutions, including a potential NPL listing, to the acid mine drainage **draining discharging** into the Upper Animas **Watershed**.

Randy Deitz

Attorney Advisor

Office of Land and Emergency Management

(202) 566-0197

From: StClair, Christie
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 4:23 PM
To: Card, Joan <Card.Joan@epa.gov>
Cc: Hamilton, Karen <Hamilton.Karen@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Cohen, Nancy <Cohen.Nancy@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Animas River health

Here's a draft response using existing language. Please let me know by 5pm eastern if you have any edits.

While the rivers returned to pre-release conditions downstream, there are still significant metal loadings from numerous mining sources in the Upper Animas mining district.

Historically, the Animas River has an elevated "normal" (pre-event) level of metals independent of the Gold King Mine release, due to the constant supply of acid mine drainage into the river from many sources. There are literally hundreds of old mines, ore processing locations and other places where acid mine drainage containing metals enters small streams and creeks that eventually enter the Animas River.

The USGS conducted sampling in the Animas River in 1995-1996 to measure the amount of metals carried by the river during the spring snowmelt period. They estimated an average metals load of approximately 2,300 kg/day. (In comparison, when the plume from last summer's Gold King Mine release reached the lower Animas River, it carried an estimated average load of 2,000 kg/day.)

EPA and the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) conducted a Superfund Site Assessment of the area in the 1990s. The assessment identified the severe impacts to aquatic life in the Upper Animas and its tributaries from naturally occurring and mining-related heavy metals. In recognition of the community-based collaborative effort, EPA agreed to postpone adding all or a portion of the site to the Superfund NPL, as long as progress was being made to improve the water quality of the Animas River. Until approximately 2005, water quality in the Animas River was improving. However, since 2005, water quality in the Animas River has not improved and, for at least 20 miles below the confluence with Cement Creek and the water quality has declined significantly. Impacts to aquatic life were also demonstrated by fish population surveys conducted by Colorado Parks and Wildlife, which found no fish in the Animas River below Cement Creek for approximately two miles and observed precipitous declines in fish populations as far as 20 miles downstream since 2005. Because of this declining water quality in the Animas River, in 2008, EPA's Superfund Site Assessment program began investigations in Upper Cement Creek focused on evaluating whether the Upper Cement Creek area alone would qualify for inclusion on the NPL. This evaluation indicated that the area would qualify, although after receiving additional community input, EPA postponed efforts to include the area on the National Priorities List. Since that time, EPA has continued and broadened its investigations of conditions at the site in order to understand the major sources of heavy metal contamination in the Upper Animas.

The EPA is currently working with state, local and tribal stakeholders to address long-term solutions, including a potential NPL listing, to the acid mine draining into the Upper Animas.

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Card, Joan

Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 3:54 PM
To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Cc: Hamilton, Karen <Hamilton.Karen@epa.gov>; Grantham, Nancy <Grantham.Nancy@epa.gov>; Deitz, Randy <Deitz.Randy@epa.gov>; Cohen, Nancy <Cohen.Nancy@epa.gov>; Jenkins, Laura Flynn <Jenkins.Laura@epa.gov>; Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Animas River health

+ Johanna and Laura

We might have something in the can on this. Johanna best to answer for Region 8.

Joan Card

Senior Policy Advisor

Region 8

Sent from my EPA iPhone

On Feb 22, 2016, at 1:35 PM, StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Karen and Joan,

Please see the back and forth between me and the Daily Caller reporter, below.

I'd welcome your thoughts on how best to describe the agency's reasons and goals for considering an NPL listing.

Christie

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Ethan Barton [<mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org>]

Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 3:33 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: Animas River health

Would I be correct to say that making the area a superfund site would combat contaminants from the mines that are impacting fisheries harvested for humans, wetlands, and Canadian Lynx? Though not listed here, I also understand that the acid mine runoff has impacted fish populations.

Even though the contaminants "impact fisheries that are harvested for human consumption," is there a danger to human health, given the EPA's view that the river is safe?

On Mon, Feb 22, 2016 at 3:26 PM, StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Ethan,

The agency addressed the goals for a potential Superfund listing in its recent letter to Gov. Hickenlooper:

<http://www.epa.gov/sites/production/files/2016-02/documents/letter-to-gov->

hickenlooper.pdf

Let me know if that doesn't address your question well enough.

Christie

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Ethan Barton [mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org]
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 3:04 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Animas River health

Great, thank you Christie.

One follow-up:

If the Animas and San Juan rivers are safe, then why has the EPA pushed to designate the area a superfund site?

Thanks,

Ethan

On Mon, Feb 22, 2016 at 2:59 PM, StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Ethan, thanks for being so patient.

Please attribute to an agency spokeswoman:

The EPA is confident that the Animas and San Juan rivers are safe for agricultural use and long-term recreational exposure. That's because water sampling has shown that both the Animas and San Juan Rivers have returned to the same condition they were in before the GKM release.

That said, acid mine drainage has been released into the rivers for many decades and winter runoff and major storms may kick up material that had settled to the bottom of the rivers. So those using the river for recreation, agriculture or drinking water should use the same precautions they always have.

EPA is working with city, state, county and tribal stakeholders to develop monitoring plans that will continue to assess the impacts of mine releases on the Animas and San Juan rivers. The monitoring will evaluate seasonal changes, including pre-winter and post-winter runoff and low-flow conditions.

The agency will continue to post water quality information as new data become available.

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Ethan Barton [mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org]

Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 12:37 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: Animas River health

Great, thank you.

On Mon, Feb 22, 2016 at 12:35 PM, StClair, Christie
<StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

I'm working on it, Ethan.

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Ethan Barton [mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org]
Sent: Monday, February 22, 2016 12:01 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Animas River health

Christie, can I expect a response soon? Thanks.

On Fri, Feb 19, 2016 at 3:55 PM, Ethan Barton
<ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org> wrote:

Monday is fine, but preferably in the morning. Thanks.

On Fri, Feb 19, 2016 at 3:54 PM, StClair, Christie
<StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Deadline COB or Monday?

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Ethan Barton [mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org]
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 3:53 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Animas River health

Yes, please. That would be great.

On Fri, Feb 19, 2016 at 3:51 PM, StClair, Christie
<StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

That's correct. I can get you some more detail if you like.

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Ethan Barton
[mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org]
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 3:43 PM

To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Animas River health

Hi Christie,

Yeah, I looked over this. My understanding is that, in essence, this says that the river is safe for use, though there are pockets with higher contamination unrelated to the Gold King Mine spill, but longterm effects require additional monitoring before conclusions can be made.

Does that sound about right?

Ethan

On Fri, Feb 19, 2016 at 3:35 PM, StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Ethan,

You may find this useful – please note it is a DRAFT and will be peer reviewed before the results are finalized:
<http://www.epa.gov/goldkingmine/epas-draft-analysis-fate-and-transport-metals-animas-and-san-juan-rivers>

Let me know if that doesn't do the trick.

Christie

Christie St. Clair

Office of Public Affairs

Environmental Protection Agency

Washington, DC

o: 202-564-2880

m: 202-768-5780

From: Ethan Barton
[mailto:ethan@dailycallernewsfoundation.org]
Sent: Friday, February 19, 2016 2:26 PM
To: StClair, Christie <StClair.Christie@epa.gov>
Subject: Animas River health

Hi Christie,

Hope all is well. I'm looking into the current health of the Animas River. I saw on the FAQ page that the EPA doesn't anticipate any adverse health effects to humans, livestock, or agriculture, and data on the impact on fish is promising, though long-term acid mine run-off has been detrimental to fish populations.

Could you please comment on the overall health of the Animas River in Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and the Navajo Nation? I'm interested in the current quality and the long term quality, as well as the influence the Gold King Mine spill had on both of those.

I think I have a good understanding after doing extensive reading, but I'd like to be certain.

Thanks,

Ethan

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter
Daily Caller News Foundation
410-829-1738
@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton
Investigative Reporter
Daily Caller News Foundation
410-829-1738
@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton
Investigative Reporter
Daily Caller News Foundation
410-829-1738
@ethanrbarton

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

[@ethanrbarton](https://twitter.com/ethanrbarton)

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

[@ethanrbarton](https://twitter.com/ethanrbarton)

--

Ethan Barton

Investigative Reporter

Daily Caller News Foundation

410-829-1738

[@ethanrbarton](https://twitter.com/ethanrbarton)